DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 456 UD 021 518

AUTHOR Comerford, James P.
TITLE Parent Perceptions and Pupil Characteristics of a Senior High Magnet School Program.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 30p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS High Schools: *Magnet Schools: *Parent Attitudes: *School Demography: *School Desegregation: Urban Schools: Voluntary Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to investigate: (1) how successful has the magnet school been in attracting a student body that is representative of the students in the school district? and (2) according to the perceptions of parents of pupils at a senior high magnet school, what are the important program and non-program factors affecting the "magnetic" quality of the school? The study focused on the High School for Creative and Performing Arts in Philadelphia. Findings regarding the first area of investigation were: (1) students at the studied high school were representative of the system-wide senior high school population in terms of sub-districts, the number of former high schools represented, and home residence: (2) more girls attended the high school than boys: (3) the school had a better racial balance than the school district: and (4) students were above average in achievement. Regarding the second area of investigation, according to parents, the most important factors in choosing a magnet school were: (1) uniqueness of curriculum: (2) safety in the school building: (3) safety in the school neighborhood: and (4) staff support of the contentions in the magnet school's literature. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUN 1 1981

ED204456

PARENT PERCEPTIONS AND PUPIL CHARACTERISTICS OF A SENIOR HIGH MAGNET SCHOOL PROGRAM

BY

JAMES P. COMERFORD

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April, 1981.

CG015518

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James P. Comerford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

A magnet school has been defined as a "school or educational center that offers a special curriculum capbable of attracting substantial numbers of different racial backgrounds." (Federal Register, 1977).

Because of the relatively recent development of magnet schools as a method of school desegregation, and because these programs are designed to attract an integrated student body on a voluntary basis, it becomes crucial to investigate and evaluate elements of the magnet school concept. Eubanks and Levine (1979) contend that "one of the most important questions about big city magnet schools is whether the students who enroll in them tend to be higher in social class background and/or home environment (as related to motivation for school achievement) than are students from the same local schools and neighborhoods who do not elect magnet options." In another study, (Levine and Campbell, 1977) the contention is made that "where magnet programs are selective, as many are, it is virtually certain that a large percentage of students come from middle-class families or upwardly mobile families of low socioeconomic status."

A second area of importance in investigating magnet schools is their "magnetic quality." That is, realizing that enrollment in magnet schools is voluntary, it is important to assess those factors that make magnet schools attractive. In a report presenting preliminary findings of the Emergency School Aid Act Magnet School Program, Royster (1978) found that several non-program factors may affect the magnetic quality of the schools. These include location of the school, the school staff, voluntary desegregation as an alternative to involuntary desegregation, the physical plant, transportation and the safety of the pupils.

The purpose of this study was to investigate two areas relating to the magnet school concept: (1) how successful has the magnet school been at attracting a student body that is representative of the students in the school district, and (2) according to the perceptions of parents of pupils at a senior high magnet school, what are the important program and non-program factors affecting the "magnetic" quality of the school.

The study focused on the High School for Creative and Performing Arts -- one of the first totally magnet senior high schools in Philadelphia which was implemented as part of the school district's voluntary desegregation plan.

PROCEDURE

Using six characteristics of students, the first question described the student body and compared them to their previous schools, and to the school district in general. The six characteristics analyzed were: pupil residence, achievement, socioeconomic environment, race, gender, and previous school. Student residence, achievement data, race and gender were available from the school district's Pupil Directory Information File. Previous school data was available from student records.

Data on socioeconomic environment was collected by listing the per-capita income of the census tract in which each student lives. Pupil census tracts were obtained from the school district's Pupil Directory Information File. Per-capita income of each census tract was available from the Philadelphia City Planning Commission (1978).

A second indicator of socio-economic environment was the type of school each student formerly attended. These were classified into public (Title I or non-Title I) and non-public (Private, Parochial, out-of-town) schools.

The second question investigated parents' perceptions via a questionnaire (Appendix A), and attempted to determine if these perceptions differed on one or more of five dependent variables: parents' race, level of education and occupation, and students' grade and gender. Program factors are those factors which have been outlined in a description of the school and its goals, and which are intended to enhance the educational program. Six program factors have been identified: quality of the school staff, uniqueness of the curriculum, an integrated study body, an integrated teaching staff, a relationship with nearby cultural institutions, and the encouragement of parental involvement.

Non-program factors are those identified by Royster (1978) McMillan (1977) and others which are not intended to be an integral part of the school program, but which have been perceived by parents as important. Six non-program factors have been identified: ease of travel from home to school, safety in the school neighborhood, safety in the school building, size of the student body, dissatisfaction with the school the student would have attended otherwise.

Student characteristics were tabulated and compared to school district data by means of simple descriptive statistics. Where appropriate a chi-square analysis or an ANOVA procedure was used to determine statistical significance.

For each item on the parent questionnaire, the mean, standard deviation, mean and mode were computed by the Univariate Procedure of SAS (Barr, et.al, 1979). In addition to these summary statistics, a five-way analysis of variance design was used for each of items 1 (A to L), 5 and 6. The dependent variable was the rating of the item. The independent variables were: grade, gender, race (two levels), occupation (four levels), and education (four levels).

For the question concerning occupation, responses were aggregated into one of ten categories, as described in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (U.S. Department of Labor, 1977).

FINDINGS

Pupil Characteristics

As a means of describing the student body at CAPA, five characteristics of students were analyzed: pupil achievement, socioeconomic environment, race, gender and residence. Five questions were investigated in reference to these data:

1. Is the student-body of the magnet school representative of the city-wide senior high school population? CAPA students came from all eight sub-districts of the school district. Of the 87 census tracts in the city, all but seven are represented by students at CAPA.

Because the school is racially balanced (55% white and 45% non-white), the proportion of white students at CAPA is greater than the proportion of white students in the school system (31%).

Of the 505 students at CAPA, 23% came from non-public schools. Of these, 18% came from private schools, 73% came from parochial schools and 9% came from out-of-town schools. The remaining students came from all but 10 of the 77 elementary, middle and junior high schools in the system (schools that have an eighth grade). Of the ten schools not represented, five are Title I schools and five are not. Only seven of the schools represented have more than ten graduates at CAPA.

While the ratio of boys to girls in the school district is about even, the school has attracted more girls than boys (66% to 34%).

In terms of achievement in Reading, as measured by the California Achievement Tests, students at CAPA tend to score higher than their counterparts throughout the school district. (Table 1).

2. Compared to their previous schools, what percentage of students in the magnet school were high or low achievers? To answer this question, the

number and percent of those students who scored higher than their former school's eighth grade average on the California Achievement Test was computed. On the subtest Total Reading, 67% scored higher than that average, while 58% scored higher than the average in Total Mathematics. A chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference between the CAPA students' performance in Total Reading (as compared to their eighth grade school) and their gender, grade or race. There was, however, a significant difference between student performance in Reading and whether or not the student attended a Title I school. (Table 2). That is, sixty percent of the CAPA students who came from non-Title I schools scored higher than their former school's eighth grade average in Total Reading, while 80% who came from Title I schools scored higher than their former school's eighth grade average.

An analysis of Total Mathematics scores revealed the same results. On this subtest, 49% scored higher from non-Title I schools, and 74% of CAPA students from Title I schools scored higher than their former school's eighth grade average. (Table 3).

Thus, compared to their eighth grade classmates, students from non-Title I schools tended to be average in math and slightly better than average in reading. Students from Title I schools, however, were above average in reading and math (compared to their eighth grade classmates).

3. What percentage of pupils came from predominatly low, middle and high income areas of the city? How does this compare with the income distribution in the city? The median per capita income environment at CAPA is between $5,000 and $5,900. (Table 4). The median in the city is $5,200. When these distributions were divided into three groups (low, medium and high) it was seen that there is little difference between the distribution at CAPA and the city-wide distribution. Of the CAPA students, 37% resided in low income census

tracts, compared to 35% of the city population: 53% resided in the middle income areas (57% city-wide); and 10% resided in the high income areas compared to 8% city-wide. (Table 5).

4. What percentage of pupils came from schools that were racially integrated? How does this compare with school district data? Fifty-two percent of the CAPA students (for whom previous school data was available) came from racially integrated schools. The percent of eighth grade students throughout the school district who are in racially integrated schools is 32%.

5. Within the various student characteristics, what differences are there by race, geographic location, achievement, grade, gender and economic environment? There was a significant difference between the variables race and economic environment. The difference is that whites tend to live in higher economic areas of the city than do minority students. (Table 6).

There was no significant difference between students' gender and race at CAPA. Similarly, there was no significant difference between (1) gender and per capita income and (2) grade and per capita income.

An analysis of variance procedure was used to examine CAPA students' eighth grade Total Reading and Total Mathematics scores by gender, race, economic environment and grade.

The first procedure revealed that there was a significant difference between the reading scores of minority and non-minority students ($F = 6.86$, $p < 0.0093$), and among the reading scores of three levels of economic environment ($F = 3.21$, $p < 0.0410$). There was no significant difference between the variables gender and Total Reading and grade and Total Reading. (Table 7).

The mean Total Reading score for majority students was 565 (67th national percentile), compared to 545 (58th national percentile) for minority students. For the three income groups, the mean scores were 543 (58th national percentile)

for those with less than $4,600; 562 (65th national percentile) for those between $4,600 and $6,900; and 568 (68th national percentile) for those over $6,900.

The second analysis of variance procedure, with Total Mathematics as the dependent variable revealed similar findings. There was a significant difference between the mathematics scores of minority and non-minority students ($F = 14.86$, $p < 0.0001$), and among the mathematics scores of three levels of economic environment ($F = 7.81$, $p < 0.0005$). There was no significant difference between the variables gender and Total Mathematics and Grade and Total Mathematics.

The mean Total Mathematics score for majority students was 527 (52nd national percentile), compared to 499 (46th national percentile) for minority students. For the three income groups (less than $4,600, between $4,600 and $6,900, and more than $6,900), the mean scores were 498 (46th national percentile), 518 (49th national percentile) and 550 (61st national percentile) respectively.

There were no significant differences between achievement and gender or between achievement and grade.

A Student t-test revealed a significant difference between the mean achievement score in reading and mathematics. In reading, the average student at CAPA scored at the 62nd national percentile compared to the 52nd national percentile in mathematics.

Analysis of Parent Questionnaires

The second part of this study investigated parents' perceptions via a questionnaire, and attempted to determine if these perceptions differed on one or more of five variables: parents' race, level of education and occupation, and students' grade and gender.

Of 505 students enrolled in the High School for Creative and Performing Arts, 254 parent questionnaires were returned. An analysis of these by student gender, grade and race indicated that they were representative of the enrollment at CAPA. The questionnaire results indicated that four of the twelve items were very important to the parents. (Table 8). That is, they had a mean score of six or more on a seven point scale. These items were: uniqueness of the curriculum, safety in the school building, safety in the school neighborhood, and the school staff. Seven of the remaining eight items were judged moderately important. That is, they received a mean score between 4.5 and 5.9. Only one item, "attractiveness of the school building" received a mean score less than 4. The mean score for this item was 3.5. For this item, 43.8% of the respondents felt it was relatively unimportant (a rating of 1 to 3).

Other items which a significant proportion of the respondents felt were not important were: dissatisfaction with the school the student would have otherwise attended (31%): desegregated teaching staff (20%); dasegregated student body (18%); opportunity for parent involvement (14%).

There was a significant relationship between parents' educational level and attractiveness of the school building, safety in the school neighborhood, safety in the school building, and an opportunity for parent involvement. (Table 9). In each of these cases the higher the educational level, the lower the perceived importance of the item. It should be pointed out, however, that these differences, although statistically significant, are in some cases quite small.

There was a significant relationshipp between parents' occupation and opportunity for parental involvement ($F = 3.51$; $p < 0.016$). Parents with professional or managerial occupations rated this item less important (4.9) than did all other parents (5.4.).

There was a significant relationship between students' race and a desegregated student body, a desegregated teaching staff, and school size. (Table 10). The differences in mean scores between whites and non-whites for school size was rather small (5.4 to 5.9). The differences between race and desegregated teaching staff (4.4 to 5.7) and desegregated student body (4.6 to 5.8) indicated that a desegregated educational environment is more important to non-whites than to white parents.

Parents were also asked if they would have sent their son or daughter to the magnet school if it were (a) predominantly white, or (b) predominantly black. Almost all respondents (97%) said they would sent their son or daughter to a predominantly white school, but only 65.5% would send their son or daughter to a predominantly black school. There was a significant difference between students' race and each of these two questions. (Table 11). For the former question, the differences were probably not meaningful (since 97% of all respondents answered yes); for the latter question, more whites (48%) said no than did non-white parents (20%).

There were no significant relationships between any of the items and students' gender or grade.

The six program items had a collective mean score of 5.6, while the six non-program items had a mean score of 5.3. Thus, program and non-program factors were considered of relatively equal importance by the responding parents. (Table 12).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Students at CAPA are representative of the system-wide senior high school population in terms of the eight sub-districts, the number of former public schools represented, and home residence (i.e., the number of city census tracts

represented). The CAPA population differs from the city public school population in that more girls attend CAPA than boys; the school has a better racial balance than the school district; and the students are above average in achievement, as measured by standardized test scores.

One of the goals of a magnet school is to attract a heterogeneous population. The CAPA school has been able to accomplish this by providing a racially balanced student body; one that is representative of the socioeconomic environment distribution in the city; and one that is representative of the non-public school population.

There are some indications that the make-up of the student body at CAPA is similar to the descriptions of magnet schools in the literature. It has been stated earlier that as of this writing, there have been no reports describing the socioeconomic environments of students from magnet schools. Levine and Campbell (1977b) have stated that in all probability, magnet schools are composed of middle class and upwardly mobile lower class students. The implication seems to be that in a subtle way the population is somewhat selective.

Eubanks and Levine (1977) have suggested that researchers determine if magnet schools cream off the most motivated and talented students from regular schools.

In describing the student body at CAPA some light has been shed on these two important questions. Specifically, as Levine and Campbell (1977b) have suggested, the student body at CAPA is composed primarily of middle and lower socioeconomically status students. Only ten percent of the students at CAPA were from high socioeconomic status environments. The distribution of income environments was quite similar to the city-wide distribution.

In order to determine if the magnet students at CAPA are the cream of the crop compared to the regular school, CAPA students' eighth grade scores

were compared to the average for their eighth grade school. The most significant finding was that while sixty-one percent of the students who attended CAPA from non-Title I schools scored higher in Total Reading than their eighth grade's average, eighty percent of CAPA students from Title I schools scored higher than their eighth grade classmates.

These data would imply that students from non-Title I schools could not be considered the "cream of the crop," while many students from Title I schools may, in fact, be so classified (compared to their eighth grade classmates). The finding that the average score in Reading among CAPA students from low income environments was at the 58th national percentile (well above the average for the city) also supports this interpretation.

These data might also support what Levine and Campbell (1977b) mean by "upwardly mobile" students from lower socioeconomic environments.

The finding that according to the parents' perceptions, the most important factors in choosing a magnet school are (1) uniqueness of the curriculum, (2) safety in the school building, (3) safety in the school neighborhood, and (4) the school staff supports the contentions in the literature. A performing arts magnet has been one of the more popular magnets implemented in big cities. It is obvious that contrary to all the rhetoric for "basic" education, there are those who feel education in the performing arts is also important. These four items represent what may be called "quality education" and "safety of the students." With the exception of safety in the school building, there were no significant differences in responses to these items by race, education, occupation, student gender or grade. For the item safety in the school building, there was a significant difference by parents' educational level. These differences, however, were somewhat small.

The finding that attractiveness of the school building is relatively unimportant to parents when choosing a magnet school is similar to Royster's (1979) findings.

This should not be interpreted, however, as saying that parents are not concerned with the physical facilities. On the questionnaire, a few parents commented that while attractiveness of the school building was unimportant, safe and educationally sound physical facilities were very important.

The finding that there was no difference between the program and non-program factors conformed to findings in the literature (McMillan, 1977 and Royster, 1979). That is, certain non-program factors, such as student safety, are perceived by parents as being just as important as certain program factors (curriculum, quality staff). It is, therefore, critical that when planning magnet schools educators give serious attention to both program and non-program factors.

One item which has received little attention in the literature was "dissatisfaction with the school your son or daughter would have attended otherwise." McMillan (1977) suggested that this was an important consideration in a non-voluntary desegregation plan. The finding that 57% of the respondents judged this item relatively important indicates that the satisfaction with one's school is an important consideration in any desegregation program -- voluntary or non-voluntary. It is also important to realize that there was no significant difference in responses to this item with any of the five independent variables.

The finding that for responses to "opportunity for parental involvement" there was a significant difference by race, occupation and education indicates that the higher one's socioeconomic status, the less concern there is for parental involvement. In a similar fashion, there was a significant relationship between parents' educational level and (1) attractiveness of the school

building, (2) safety in the school building, (3) safety in the school neighborhood, as well as (4) opportunity for parental involvement. In each case, the higher the educational level, the lower the perceived importance of the item. These differences indicate a matter of degree rather than a substantial difference of opinion. Nevertheless, these differences are perhaps an indication (among parents of higher educational levels) of lower anxiety over their children's school. This difference, however, was not clear enough on three of the four items to be observed among parents of higher occupational levels. This tendency, however, would tend to dislodge any generality that parents of lower socio-economic status have less concern over their children's schooling.

Four items were related to race as an issue: (1) a desegregated student body, (2) a desegregated teaching staff, (3) would parents have sent their son/daughter to this school if it were predominantly white or (4) predominantly black. For each of these items there was a significant difference by race. Responses to the first two items indicated that a desegregated educational environment was more important to non-whites than to white parents. Responses to the latter two questions indicate that non-whites (94%) and whites (99%) are willing to attend a predominantly white school to get a quality education, but only 80% of non-whites and 52% of whites were willing to attend a predominantly black school to get that same educational program.

The practical implication of this finding is that a racially balanced school is necessary to attract wide segments of the population. As the balance tips towards a majority of non-white students it will be more difficult to attract white students and some black students.

Recommendations for Further Research

(1) This study dealt with one senior high magnet school. Student characteristics and parent perceptions of magnet schools for other age groups, and for other areas of specialization need to be investigated. A study might also be done on student characteristics and parent perceptions of a magnet school in which students were not particularly gifted academically.

(2) This study implied that the magnet school attracted the more talented students from schools in lower socio-economic areas (Title I schools). In a system where a number of magnet schools are implemented, how would this effect the achievement, motivation, morale of the lower socioeconomic area schools? The implications of these findings need to be investigated.

(3) This investigation was concerned with pupil characteristics and parent perceptions of a magnet school in its first four years. What is needed is a longitudinal study to determine if these characteristics and perceptions change as the school develops a reputation in the community.

TABLE 1

CAT RESULTS - TOTAL READING
CAPA AND SCHOOL DISTRICT

GRADE	CAPA			SCHOOL DISTRICT			
	N	%'ile[a]	Mean[b]	N	%'ile[a]	Mean[b]	Smeas[c]
9	125	60	64.0	17207	32	50.5	.312
10	162	57	68.5	16455	26	55.0	.301
11	131	48	55.0	12961	27	45.0	.327
12	56	49	58.0	11406	28	48.0	.496

[a]Percentile rank of the mean score.

[b]For each grade level, the differences between mean scores were statistically significant, with $p < .01$.

[c]Standard error of measurement between mean scores.

TABLE 2

CROSSTABULATION OF TITLE I BY BETRREAD[e]

	BETRREAD		
	Lower	Higher	Total
Non-Title I	79[a] 25.82[b] 39.30[c] 79.00[d]	122 39.87 60.70 59.22	201 65.69
Title I	21 6.86 20.00 21.00	84 27.45 80.00 40.78	105 34.31
Total	100 32.68	206 67.32	306 100.00

chi-square = 11.682 df = 1 p 0.0006

[a]Frequency

[b]Percent

[c]Row Percent

[d]Column Percent

[e]The variable BETRREAD divides students into two categories: (1) those whose eighth grade reading score was higher than their former school's eighth grade average; and those whose score was lower than their former school's eighth grade average.

TABLE 3

CROSSTABULATION OF TITLE I BY BETRMATH

	BETRMATH		
	LOWER	HIGHER	TOTAL
Non-Title I	100[a] 33.00[b] 50.51[c] 78.74[d]	98 32.34 49.49 55.68	198 65.35
Title I	27 8.91 25.71 21.26	78 25.74 74.29 44.32	105 34.65
Total	127 41.91	176 58.09	303 100.00

chi-square = 17.321 df = 1 p < 0.0001

[a]Frequency

[b]Percent

[c]Row Percent

[d]Column Percent

TABLE 4

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CAPA STUDENTS RESIDING IN VARIOUS PER CAPITA INCOME AREAS

Income Area	N	%
2000-2900	4	0.80
3000-3900	91	18.27
4000-4900	102	20.48
5000-5900	170	34.14
6000-6900	80	16.06
7000-7900	18	3.61
8000-8900	13	2.61
9000-9900	0	0.00
10000-10900	0	0.00
11000-11900	5	1.00
12000-12900	11	2.22
13000 +	4	0.81
Total	498	100.00

TABLE 5

INCOME ENVIRONMENT GROUPS AT CAPA COMPARED TO THE CITY

	Income Grouping		
	Low	Middle	High
CAPA	37%	53%	10%
City	35%	57%	8%

TABLE 6

CROSSTABULATION OF RACE BY
ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

	Less than $4600	$4600 to $6900	More than $6900	Total
White	30[a]	96	20	146
	9.80[b]	31.37	6.54	47.71
	20.55[c]	65.75	13.70	
	24.19[d]	61.15	80.00	
Non-White	94	61	5	160
	30.72	19.93	1.63	52.29
	58.75	38.13	3.13	
	75.81	38.85	20.00	
Total	124	157	25	306
	40.52	51.31	8.17	100.00

chi-square = 49.297 df = 2 p < 0.0001

[a]Frequency [c]Row Percent

[b]Percent [d]Column Percent

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF ANOVA RESULTS OF TOTAL
READING BY RACE, INCOME,
GENDER AND GRADE

Independent Variables	df	SS	F	p
Race	1	33818	6.86	0.0093
Income	2	31602	3.21	0.0419
Grade	3	18630	1.26	0.2877
Gender	1	542	0.11	0.7404

TABLE 8

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ITEM #1
OF THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Item	Rank	M	SD	Median	Mode	%Imp.	%Not Imp.
1A Curriculum	1	6.73	9.785	7	7	97.2	1.2
1B Building	12	3.50	1.807	4	4	30.1	43.8
1C Safe Area	3	6.25	1.410	7	7	88.1	5.6
1D Safe School	2	6.48	1.124	7	7	91.2	2.8
1E Travel	6	5.75	1.646	6	7	79.8	9.9
1F Deseg. Std.	9	5.08	1.975	6	7	63.4	17.6
1G Deseg. Tch.	10	4.97	2.087	6	7	62.0	20.4
1H School Size	7	5.67	1.719	6	7	79.4	10.3
1I Staff	4	6.219	1.378	7	7	79.7	5.2
1J Cultural	5	5.835	1.558	6	7	84.3	8.4
1K Parent Involvment	8	5.209	1.766	5	7	71.1	14.1
1L Dissatisfd.	11	4.619	2.454	5	7	57.4	31.1

TABLE 9

MEAN VALUES BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL
FOR FOUR SIGNIFICANT ITEMS

Item	Educational Level							
	17 yrs.		13-16 yrs.		12 yrs		<12 yrs.	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
1B Attractiveness of School Bldg.	48	3.08	69	3.25	76	3.93	17	3.94
1C Safe Area	48	5.62	71	6.27	76	6.57	18	6.78
1D Safe School	47	6.06	71	6.48	75	6.71	18	6.78
1K Parent Involvement	48	4.44	71	5.31	73	5.52	18	5.67

TABLE 10

F VALUES AND CORRESPONDING PROBABILITIES
FROM ANOVA PROCEDURE

Item	Race		Occupation		Education		Gender		Grade	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1A	0.76	0.3851	0.37	0.7746	2.23	0.0846	1.22	0.2705	1.35	0.2596
1B	1.06	0.3051	1.27	0.2866	3.11	0.0270	0.60	0.4405	0.68	0.5681
1C	0.10	0.7482	1.78	0.1496	6.03	0.0007	1.44	0.2311	0.66	0.5826
1D	0.08	0.7788	1.26	0.2889	4.07	0.0079	1.77	0.1849	1.81	0.1442
1E	0.66	0.4175	0.31	0.8184	0.32	0.8111	0.14	0.7084	1.49	0.2158
1F	21.25	0.0001	1.92	0.1255	0.33	0.8059	1.31	0.2538	0.61	0.6151
1G	22.32	0.0001	1.47	0.2236	0.32	0.8113	1.60	0.2067	0.24	0.8704
1H	4.71	0.0312	1.08	0.3579	1.47	0.2225	1.36	0.2442	1.46	0.2266
1I	0.02	0.8803	0.73	0.5414	2.09	0.1017	0.73	0.3939	0.52	0.6760
1J	0.73	0.3950	0.61	0.6116	1.08	0.3600	1.64	0.2025	0.51	0.6771
1K	12.92	0.0004	3.51	0.0162	4.85	0.0030	0.11	0.7382	1.84	0.1388
1L	0.03	0.8700	0.19	0.9041	1.50	0.2157	0.12	0.7277	1.27	0.2854

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF ANOVA RESULTS OF ITEMS FIVE AND SIX BY RACE, OCCUPATION, GENDER AND GRADE

Independent Variable	DF	SS	F	P
		Item Five		
Race	1	0.1860	5.87	0.0163
Occupation	3	0.0480	0.51	0.6833
Education	3	0.1551	1.63	0.1817
Gender	1	0.0336	1.06	0.3047
Grade	3	0.0052	0.05	0.9775
		Item Six		
Race	1	3.9184	18.64	0.0001
Occupation	3	0.4481	0.71	0.5503
Education	3	1.5055	2.39	0.0690
Gender	1	0.0781	0.37	0.5429
Grade	3	1.2239	1.94	0.1226

TABLE 12

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF PROGRAM AND NON-PROGRAM FACTORS

FACTOR	MEAN	SD	MEDIAN	MODE	%IMPORT.	%NOT IMP.
Program	5.65	1.059	5.83	7	79.3	7.5
Non-Program	5.35	0.955	5.50	6	71.7	7.9

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

HIGH SCHOOL FOR CREATIVE & PERFORMING ARTS
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Listed below are some characteristics which might make a difference to a parent planning to send a child to a magnet school. On a scale of 1 to 7, please indicate how important each of the following was to you when you were deciding to send your son/daughter to this school. For example, if the "uniqueness of the curriculum" was a very important consideration in your decision, then circle 7. If it had no influence on your decision, then circle 1. (Circle your choice for each item.)

	Not Important						Very Important
A. Uniqueness of the curriculum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B. Attractiveness of school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C. Safety in the school neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
D. Safety in the school building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E. Ease of travel from home	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
F. An integrated student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
G. An integrated teaching staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H. Size of the student body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I. The school staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
J. A relationship with surrounding cultural institutions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
K. Opportunity for parent involvement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
L. Dissatisfaction with the school your son/daughter would otherwise have attended.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
M. Other (Please specify.) _____ _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Which would you consider to be the most important of the above factors? (Write in the appropriate letter.) _____

3. Which would you consider to be the least important of the above factors? (Write in the appropriate letter.) ____

4. When your son/daughter enrolled in this school, were you aware that this is a racially integrated school?

   _____yes _____no

5. Would you have sent your son/daughter to this school if it had over 75 percent white students? _____yes _____no

6. Would you have sent your son/daughter to this school if had over 75 percent black students?_____yes _____no

QUESTIONS 7 TO 11 CONTAIN INFORMATION WHICH IS PERSONAL, BUT WHICH WILL ASSIST US IN INTERPRETING THE RESULTS OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. THE INFORMATION IS VOLUNTARY, AND IS ANONYMOUS SINCE WE HAVE NO WAY TO IDENTIFY YOUR RESPONSE WITH YOU.

7. In what grade is your son/daughter who attends the School for Creative and Performing Arts? (circle one)

   9 10 11 12

8. What sex is he/she? (circle one) MALE FEMALE

9. What is your occupation?

   Husband _____

   Wife _____

10. To what ethnic or racial group do you belong? (Circle the appropriate number.)

White	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other
1	2	3	4	5	6

11. How many years of school have you completed? (Circle the appropriate number.)

	Grade								High School				College or Technical				Post Graduate
Husband	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Wife	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17

12. Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Feel free to add any comments below.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barr, A.J., Goodnight, J.H., Sall, J.P., & Helwig, J.T. SAS user's guide. Raleigh, N.C.: SAS Institute, 1979.

Levine, Daniel U., & Campbell, Connie. Developing and implementing big-city magnet school programs. In Daniel U. Levine & Robert J. Havighurst (Eds.), The future of big-city schools. Berkeley. McCutchan Publishing Co., 1977. (a)

Levine, Daniel U. & Campbell, Connie. Magnet schools in urban education. A report by the center for the study of metropolitan problems in education, Kansas City, Mo.: University of Missouri, June, 1977.

Levine, Daniel U., & Eubanks, Eugene E. A study of selected issues involving magnet schools in big city school districts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1979.

Levine, Daniel U., & Havighurst, Robert J. (Eds.). The future of big-city schools. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1977.

Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Tract group profile update. A report prepared for the city of Philadelphia, 1978.

Royster, Eugene C., Baltzell, Catherine D., & Ferb, Karen. Study of the emergency school aid act magnet school program: interim report. A report prepared by Apt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass., 1978.